

8266
MAN's Original Righteousness;

A N D

*GOD's Covenant with ADAM, as a publick
Person; asserted and plainly proved from the
Scripture, as the Basis of the true Doctrine
of ORIGINAL SIN.*

I N T W O

S E R M O N S.

W I T H A N

A P P E N D I X,

Relating to a B O O K lately published

B Y T H E

Rev. Mr J. T A Y L O R,

O F

N O R W I C H,

Against the D O C T R I N E of

O R I G I N A L S I N.

By S A M U E L H E B D E N. K

L O N D O N :

Printed for R. H E T T, at the *Bible and Crown*;
and J. O S W A L D, at the *Rose and Crown*; both
in the *Poultry*. 1740. [Price Six-pence.]

MAINTAINING THE
GOD OF THE
THE
OF THE
OF THE

IN TWO
SERMONS

WITH
APPENDIX

Relating to a Book lately published



REV. A. T. LOR

W. C. H.

ORIGINAL

By Samuel H. B. D. N.

OF THE
OF THE
OF THE
OF THE
OF THE

S E R M O N I.

ECCLES. VII. 29.

Lo, this only have I found, that God made Man upright; but they have sought out many Inventions.

IN this Text the Wise Man invites our serious Observation of the woful Corruption and Degeneracy of Mankind, as departed very far from the original Rectitude of human Nature, and addicted to many foolish, hurtful, sinful Ways. This general Corruption he had pointed at before, *ver. 28*, where he declares, as to the *Men* and *Women* he had observed, and had been conversant with, that he could find but a very small Number of wise good *Men*, and rather fewer prudent, virtuous, religious *Women*. But then, lest any should blame the Providence of God for *this*, he further observes, that these corrupt, vicious Persons of both Sexes, were greatly altered from what God made Man at first, and their being what they *now* were, was the Effect of a wretched Apostacy from God. *Lo, this only have I found, that God made Man upright; but they, &c.*

Lo, this only have I found: The original Words stand in this Order, *Only, see thou, (or observe thou) I have found.*

A 2

Only,

Only. This Word is rendered *apart*, Zech. xii. 12, and *besides*, in many other Places. Here it seems to set a Mark on what it is prefixed to, and to distinguish it from many other things, (attended with Difficulties, and not so evident) as a Truth of very great Importance and Certainty.—*See thou*, or observe thou; he speaks to every one in particular, every Reader and Hearer, You, me, and others, whom he invites to observe, to consider, what he was about to offer.—*I have found*, I have discovered this Truth, and assert on the clearest and fullest Evidence, What? *that God made Man upright; but they have sought out many Inventions.*

For *Man*, the original Word is, *Adam*, which Name is variously applied in the Scripture. To the first Man; to both our first Parents, Gen. i. 26, 27. Chap. v. 2; to Mankind in common; and to any one of *Adam's* Descendants; (not to add that with the distinguishing Epithet of *last*, or *second*, it is one of the Names of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and it is the Name of a City not far from *Jordan*, Josh. iii. 16^a).

God made Man upright: The Question is, Does this relate to the first of Mankind only? or to Mankind in every Age? That it relates to the *first* of Mankind, all grant: There is no Difference of Opinions as to *that*: But some will have it, that it equally refers to the natural State of Mankind in every Age. Whither this be true or no, we shall hear presently, when we have settled the true meaning of this Term, *upright*. Now the *Hebrew* Word יָשָׁר^b *jasbar*, which we render *upright*,
in

^a See my Sermon for Mrs S. Harper, on Job xiv. 1, 2. pag. 5, 6.

^b From this some derive *Jeshurun*, which Name is given to the *Israelites*, to signify the *Uprightness* that ought to be found in them, as the Descendants of good old *Jacob*, or *Israel*.

in the proper native Signification of it, is opposed to, crooked, irregular, perverse, &c. Not to mention the several Things it is applied to^c to signify their being straight, agreeable to Rule, &c. we find this Character given to God and Man, with the Words and Works of both. As applied to God, the Ways of God, the Word of God, it is joined with Good, Psal. xxv. 8. with Righteous, Psal. cxix. 137. with true and good, Nehem. ix. 13. where Mention is made of right Judgments, true Laws, good Statutes. The Uprightness, or as it is in the Hebrew Uprightnesses^d, in, or with, which God is said to minister Judgment to the People^e answers to Righteousness. In one Word, God's Uprightness is the moral Rectitude of his Nature, by which he is invariably disposed, and determined to act, in all his Dealings with his Creatures, agreeably to the Standard of his own infinite Perfections, or in such a Manner, as it becomes an infinitely wise, good, just, and in all respects, most perfect Being to do. Again, The Uprightness of Man is his Conformity of Heart and Manners, to the Rule he is under, which is the Law, or Will of God, some way or other signified to him. Accordingly, we read of Uprightness of Heart, Psal. xxxvi. 10. Job. xxxiii. 3. and Uprightness of Way, or Conversation, Psal. xxxvii. 14. and often elsewhere. The Upright Man, throughout the Scripture, is a truly good Man, a righteous Man, a Man

^c It may be applied to *O*, *sublime*, as *Ovid* calls it, the erect Posture, by which the *Body* of Man is distinguished, and this, say some, may be considered as designed for an external Representation of the Uprightness of the Soul.

^d This, as ascribed to God, might seem to denote the most perfect Uprightness, was not the same plural Noun, which indeed wants a singular, applied to Creatures, as *Cant.* i. 4. where what we render, *the Upright love thee*, is in the Hebrew *Mesharim Ahebuka*, Uprightnesses, for, the Upright love thee, or, they love thee in Uprightnesses, or uprightly.

^e Psal. ix. 8.

Man of Integrity, a holy Person. In *Job. i. 1. 8.* *chap. 2. 3.* *Upright* is the same with *perfect*^f, and is explained by, *one who feareth God, and escheweth Evil.* In *Job. viii. 6.* it is joined, and the same with *pure.* Besides these, let me just point at a few of the many other Passages, which warrant our Explication of this Word, *Upright*, in the Text, *Prov. x. 29.* "The Way of the Lord is Strength to the Upright, but Destruction shall be to the Workers of Iniquity," where the *Upright*, and *Workers of Iniquity*, are opposed to each other. *Chap. xi. 3.* There, *Integrity* is ascribed to the *Upright*, (*jescharim*) and these are opposed to *Transgressors.* *Ver. 6.* *Righteousness* is ascribed to the same Persons, who again are, *ver. 11.* opposed to *wicked Persons.* *Chap. xv. 3.* "The Sacrifice of the Wicked, is an Abomination to the Lord, but the Prayer of the Upright, (*jescharim*) is his Delight". *Chap. xxi. 18.* the *Righteous* and the *Upright* are the same, and Persons of these Characters are opposed to the *Wicked* and *Transgressors*, *ver. 29* "A wicked Man hardneth his Face, but as for the upright, he directeth his Way." In *Prov. xxviii. 10.* Our Translators render *jescharim* by *just*, as the same with *perfect*, *Tamim*, which, or *Temimim*, in several other Places they render *upright*. Let any now, if they can, confront these Texts (besides which, many more might be produced from the Writings of *Solomon*, and other Parts of Scripture) with other Passages forbidding us to assert, as we confidently do, that *Uprightness*, as applied to *Men*, is always the same with *Righteousness*, *Goodness*, *Integrity*, &c. When therefore the Wise-Man tells us, *that God made Man upright*, the evident undeniable Meaning of it is, that God at first, formed Man, *righteous,*

^f So in *Psal. xxxvi. 37.* and other Places. For *perfect* in our Translation, the *Hebrew* has sometimes *Tam*, and sometimes *Jasbar*.

righteous, holy, &c. or put into him a Propensity to act in Conformity to *Truth*; That the Heart and Life of Man, in his original State, were perfectly regular: I say, *in his original State*; for, if *Uprightness* is the same with *Righteousness*, as undeniably it is, it can refer, *only to what Man was originally*, since all grant, (and common easy Observation confirms it, as well as the Scripture) that Mankind *now*, are not born, and made *righteous* or *holy*. Yet, says the Wise-Man, *God made Man upright*, or *righteous*, *i. e.* he made him so, *at first*; but they have sought out many Inventions. They, this refers to *Adam*, which is both a singular and plural Noun; *They, i. e.* Mankind, our first Parents, and with them their Posterity, have sought out many Inventions, many Contrivances to offend *GOD*, and injure themselves. These *many Inventions*, are opposed to the *Uprightness* afore-mentioned, the Simplicity of Heart, the Plain-heartedness, Integrity, Righteousness, with which our first Parents, and Mankind in them, were *originally* made by *GOD*.

The Doctrine of the Text then is, that *GOD originally, or at his first Creation made Man ^s upright, or righteous*: He formed him not only *rational*, and a *free Agent*, but *holy*. He made him not only capable of knowing, loving and serving *GOD*, but with such a Principle of Love and Obedience to his *Maker*, as disposed and enabled him, to perform the whole of his Duty with Ease and Delight: Tho' *Holiness*, or a supreme Love to *GOD*, was in a Sense, *supernatural to him*, it being superadded to the essential Powers and Faculties of his Nature, as a Man; It was however, thus far *natural* to him, that

^s The Way of speaking here used plainly, points out the *Connaturalness* of Uprightness, or Righteousness, with the human Soul, in it's original State; for 'tis not said, God *first*, made Man, and *then*, made him upright, but *God made Man upright*.

that it was *concreated* with his rational Powers. He was, at once, made *Rational*, and *Holy*. To say otherwise, and assert the Impossibility of *This*; to maintain, that Man neither was, nor could be formed with *original Righteousness*, or *Holiness*, because he must chuse to be *righteous*, before he could be *righteous*; And therefore he must exist, he must be created; yea, he must exercise Thought and Reflection before he was *righteous*; and that none can be *righteous*, but in Consequence of his own Choice and Endeavour: ^h This is bold with a Witness, and an Instance, (if I may have leave to say it) either of great Inconsideration or strong Prejudice; It is in effect, a contradicting express Scripture, and evident Fact, since the Text dos not say, *GOD made Man* capable of becoming *upright*, or *righteous*; but, he *made Man upright*, which if we conform to the good old Rule, of interpreting *Scripture* by *Scripture*, must signify, that *GOD* made Man, at first, *righteous*, or *holy*.—But I would further strengthen this Interpretation of the Text, and further confirm the Doctrine contained in it as so interpreted by the following Arguments.

I. *Moses* in his Account of the Creation, represents *GOD*, as saying, “Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness.” Here, as the Ancients ⁱ observe, *GOD* the Father is brought in, speaking to his Son and Spirit. Of these two Words, *Image* and *Likeness*, various Explications are given: Some distinguish them, others reckon them equivalent, or to signify a perfect Kind of Likeness; some would extend this *Image*, and, (or *Likeness*) to

^h To this Purpose Mr *J. Taylor* speaks in his late Treatise of *Original Sin*.

ⁱ *Barnabas* and *Justin Martyr* represent God the Father as speaking thus to his Son. *Irenæus* and several others represent him, as speaking it to his Son and Spirit, his Word and Wisdom, whom *Irenæus* calls the *Hands of God*, by whom he freely and voluntarily made all things.

to the Body of Man, others restrain it to the Soul. Some are for including herein the *Happiness* of the primitive State of Man, while others chuse rather to consider *that*, as a Result from what the Scripture mentions as Man's original Likeness to God. Some reckon Man's *Dominion* over the other Creatures, as one Part of the *Image of God* in which he was at first made; while others distinguish these two, as *Moses* plainly does in the Text now before us. Some, *i. e.* the *Pelagians*, and *Socinians* understand it of the rational Faculties of Man's Nature; together with the Dominion given him, exclusively of what we call *Original Righteousness*, or Holiness; but that this must be included, and was indeed, the principal Part (tho' not the whole) of the *Image of God* in which he made Man, appears as from the Text fairly interpreted, according to the constant Use of the Word *Upright* in the Scripture, so from *Ephes.* iv. 22, 24. and *Col.* iii. 9, 10. For explaining these two Passages of the Apostle, I observe. (1.) By the *Old Man* is not meant an *beastly Life*, as it has been lately interpreted, ^k or any ungodly Conversation, but a *corrupt Nature*, or an habitual Propensity to Sin. For the Apostle elsewhere speaks of *our old Man*, as *crucified with Christ*, and here he distinguishes from it, their former Conversation and sinful Actions, which he calls the Deeds of the Old Man. Again, by the *New Man*, is meant, *not a new Course of Life* (as the *Socinians* ^l weakly and injudiciously interpret it) but, a Principle of Grace in the Soul, called *the hidden Man of the Heart*, ^m and a *divine Nature*, ⁿ as well as by several other Names. To put off the old Man,

B

is

^k By Mr *J. Taylor*, of *Norwich*, in his late Book of *Original Sin*.

^l Whom the *Gentleman* just mentioned, follows in his Doctrine, and Explication of *this*, and other Texts of Scripture.

^m 1 Pet. iii. 4.

ⁿ 2 Pet. i. 4.

is the same as, *to crucify the Flesh*, Gal. v. 24. and *to make no Provision for the Flesh*, Rom. xiii. 14. It is, to mortify and subdue the corrupt Principle, which every renewed Soul feels, laments, and abhors in itself. To *put on the New Man*, is to cultivate and stir up the gracious Principle, the new Nature, which the Spirit of God had begun in them. *This*, says the Apostle, *is created after God in Righteousness, and Holiness of Truth*. It is *created*, which can't properly be said of a new Course of Life; but is proper enough, as to a new Nature, or a new Principle breathed into the Soul. It is *created after God*, or in his Image and Likeness. In these Words, *created after God*, the Apostle seems to point at what *Moses* writes, *Gen. i. 27.* of Man's being at first made in the Image of God, or after his Likeness. Well, what is it to be made in the Image and Likeness of God, or, to be *created after God*? The Apostle answers, it is to be created, *in Righteousness and true Holiness*, for which, (in *Eph. iv. 24.*) he puts Knowledge, *Col. iii. 10.* For these, *a practical Knowledge of God*, and *Righteousness with Holiness* are the same. We see then, what it is that constitutes Man's *principal* Conformity to God: It is not his *rational Powers*, which, without a sincere prevailing Love to God, or a practical Knowledge of God, render Man viler than the Beasts of the Field; but it is, *Righteousness*, or *Holiness*, which two are sometimes distinguished, and often put promiscuously for each other: When distinguished, *Righteousness* is a Disposition to act, as becomes us, with-Regard to the Creature: *Holiness* is a Principle of Love to God himself, as distinguished from all others; or, it is a steady Inclination to practise the Duties that we owe to him. But often, *either* of these two Words is put for the whole of Man's Duty; or a Principle disposing and enabling him to act agreeably to his Duty, both

as to God and others. This the Apostle speaks of, as the Glory, or chief Excellency of Man, 2 Cor. iii. 21. *We all, who are true Christians, beholding as in a Glass, the Glory of the Lord, are changed into the same Image from Glory to Glory, or from one Degree of Holiness to another, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.* If now *Righteousness*, or *Holiness*, is the most amiable Endowment of the human Soul, and what gives it it's most desirable Likeness to God: And if, to be created after God, or in his Image and Likeness, is to be created in *Righteousness* and true *Holiness*, or with a practical Knowledge of God; and, if that Principle of *Righteousness*, or *Holiness*, by which we are created unto good Works, or in order to the doing of such Works (*Ephes. ii. 10.*) is a *New Man*, a *Divine Nature*, or God-like Disposition; hence it is easy to infer, that Man was created at first, *Righteous*, *Holy*, disposed to perform the whole of his Duty, both in regard to God, and every one whom he should be concerned with. Tho' *Man* might be said to resemble God his Maker, in that his *Soul* is immaterial, intelligent, and immortal, *Gen. ix. 6. Jam. iv. 9.* Yet from the aforecited *Texts* of the Apostle *Paul*, we learn what is principally meant, by a being created after God, or made in the Likeness of God, namely, a being made *righteous* and *holy*, or *upright*, which therefore was the primitive Original State of Man.

II. All things, as at first made by God, were very good; agreeable to the *Ideas* of the Divine Mind, and such as it became the most Holy One to make them. Now a *rational Being*, whose thinking, considering, reasoning, remembring, elective Powers, were not devoted to God, or in a readiness to be employed for him, could hardly be accounted *Good*. If *Man*, as well as every other Species of Creatures, was good in his Kind, and the

Goodness of such a Being as *Man*, must lie in a Devotedness and Consecration to God; 'tis evident, that *Man* was no sooner made by *God*, than he was inclinable and ready to serve God, in whatever Manner his Service should be required; which Inclination, and Readiness to serve God was *Righteousness*, or *Holiness*. This the Apostle calls *Goodness*, "I know that in Me, that is, in my Flesh, there dwelleth no good Thing," in me, so far as I am unrenewed, there dwelleth nothing of the Goodness, that the Law of God requires of the rational Creature as such. The *Goodness* which the Law of God now and always requires of Man, as made by God capable of loving and serving himself, is *Righteousness*, or *true Holiness*. Now this Goodness, this Rectitude, this Uprightness, this regular and due State, or Disposition of the human Mind was *natural* to Man at first; 'Twas wrought into his Nature, and concreated with his rational Powers; because, as *Moses* says, all things made by God were, in their original State, very good. The *rational* Creature, as such, is made capable of knowing, loving, serving, living in Communion with the most Holy One; but if, being made *so capable*, the Powers and Faculties of his Nature are not consecrated to *God*, he is on that Account worse than all inferior Creatures. An *holy Person*, as such, is one, all whose Powers and Faculties are dedicated to *God*; or one who chuses to be for *God*; or one who steadily and earnestly inclines to honour the Lord, with what he is, and has. Such an one, undoubtedly, was *Man*, when he first came out of the Hands of *God*.

III. When *God* vested *Man* with a Dominion over the other Creatures of this World, what *Capacity*, or *Disposition* could he have duly to exercise that Dominion and Authority, without a Principle of Love and Obedience to the great *God* himself; who

who made the Creatures serviceable to *Man*, and framed them with a Disposition to submit to him, that *Man* might be induced thereby to persevere in his Dependance on, and voluntary Subjection to, *his* G O D. Did not a good G O D frame the inferior Creatures with a Disposition to submit to *Man* their Superior and Lord; as well as with Capacities of being useful and serviceable to him? If so, where is the Absurdity of believing that *Man* was originally framed by a wise and good G O D, with a Disposition to submit to, and live dependant on, the *Lord of all*; as well as with natural Capacities for such a Submission and practical Dependance? What an agreeable *Analogy* and Harmony was there between the inferior Creatures being made by G O D ready for the serving of *Man*, and *Man's* being made ready or disposed to serve G O D.

IV. Either *Man* was originally framed with Principles of Love and Obedience rooted in his Nature, or he was made at first an Enemy to G O D. One of these must be supposed for this plain Reason, because as all the Duty required of *Man*, as an intelligent moral Agent, is summarily comprehended in *Love*, a supreme Love to G O D as the greatest and best Being, and *Man's* Creator, and Preserver, and a subordinate Love to others for his sake; so there can be no *Medium* between an intelligent Creature's *Love* to G O D, and a degree of *Enmity* against him, or Disaffection to him. Either, O *Man*, thou lovest the Lord thy G O D with all thine Heart, or thou dost not; if *thou dost*, thou art inclinable to be obedient to him in all Things, and to avoid whatever is forbidden to thee by him, *i. e.* thou art holy, or righteous: If *thou dost not*, thou art indisposed to serve him in such a manner, or with such a Frame of Spirit, as he requires; thou art a Rebel

bel against his Authority, and an Enemy to him. Since therefore it would be greatly absurd to consider *Man* as originally made by *GOD* in a State of Enmity against him, or without an entire readiness of Soul to be obedient to every Divine Command, and submissive to every Divine Restraint; it must be believed, by every one who can reason and think consistently, that *Man* in his primitive State was a Friend of *GOD*, a Lover of him, or in other Words *righteous* and *holy*. Either he was formed *with* or *without* the Knowledge of *GOD*. To suppose the *latter*, is highly absurd, since his Knowledge of the *Creatures*, discovering itself in his being able to give proper significant Names ° to them; his being appointed to sanctify the Seventh Day, in Remembrance of *GOD*'s resting from his creating Work, with the entire *Mosaic* Account of the primitive State of *Man*, demonstrate his being originally impress'd with some Sense of *GOD* and Divine Things upon his Mind. But would a good and holy *GOD* imprint some Degree of Divine Knowledge on the Mind of *Man*, and give him a Capacity of greatly improving his original Stock of Knowledge, and not inspire him with a Degree of Divine Love and Sacred Zeal? Impossible.

If therefore any deny the *original Righteousness of Man innocent*, I might reason with such in the

° A very *Learned Man* conjectures that *Adam* gave Names to the *Heavenly Bodies*, as well as *Terrestrial Animals*; but *Moses* gives no Hint of that. As to the Names given by *Adam*, whom some affect to represent as very simple and ignorant, to the various Species of *Creatures* belonging to this Earth, 'tis reasonable to suppose they were *proper* and *significant*; since all the antientest Names on Record are of such a Kind, and *GOD* would scarcely have brought them before *Adam*, to see what he would call them, if he had not been well acquainted with their Natures, and capable of giving them suitable Names. His Dominion over them seems to have required some good Knowledge of them.

the Manner following. Can you deny, if you carefully read the Scripture, and will allow *that* to be it's own Interpreter, either *that* GOD at first *made Man upright*, or that *Uprightness* is the same with *Righteousness* and *Holiness*? Can you prove either that Man was not *created after* GOD, or that this dos not mean, according to the Apostle's Explication of it, a Being *created in Righteousness and true Holiness*? Was not *Man* as well as all other Creatures good in his Kind; and can a Being made by GOD *rational* with any Propriety be called *good*, whose Thinking, and other natural Powers, are not dedicated to GOD, or in a Readiness to act for *him*? Is it reasonable to suppose that Man when first made was disinclined to contemplate the Works of GOD, with suitable Sentiments and Affections of Soul; which if he was in a natural Readiness and Disposedness for, he was made *holy* as well as *rational*? Was *Man* in his primitive State capable, or disposed, with a due Temper of Soul, to exercise the Authority granted him over the other Creatures, if not inspired with a Principle of Love and Duty to his Sovereign Lord and Ruler? I defy any of the *Pelagian* or *Socinian* Deniers of *original Righteousness*, and *original Sin*, to prove either that Man can be *innocent*, and *sinless*, if he dos not love the Lord his GOD with all his Heart, or that such a Love to GOD is not *Righteousness* and true Holiness; or that this sacred or divine Love did not glow in the Heart of *Adam* at his first Creation. —But though Man was created *holy* he was *mutable*, capable of altering for the worse as well as of improving for the better. He was not without sufficient Abilities to persevere in well-doing, and secure Eternal Life to himself thereby; to perform every Duty, and withstand every Temptation; to improve the Stock of divine Knowledge and

and other Gifts imparted to him ; to continue beholding, admiring, adoring and enjoying God, in, and by, each of his various Works ; to renew delightful Tastes and Relishes of his Maker's Love whenever he would ; yet being left to the Freedom of his own Will, he might, and did *soon* fall : How soon none can say : not so soon, I am confident, as some are willing to suppose, who argue, that Man probably fell on the very Day of his Creation, from *Psal.* xlix. 12. mis-translated thus, *Adam being in honour lodged not there all Night ;* from *John* viii. 44. *The Devil was a Murderer from the Beginning*, i. e. say some from the six first Days commonly called by the *Jews*, the Beginning, (accordingly the *Syriac* Version has, *from in the Beginning*.) *Adam*, says *Lightfoot*, was created about nine o'Clock in the Morning, fell about Noon, and heard the first Promise about Three in the Afternoon. But this was scarce possible. ^p 'Tis much more likely, that *Man*, the last of God's Works was not created, and introduced into the Garden of *Eden*, till towards the Close of the sixth Day ; that the first Sabbath was observed by Man while yet innocent ; and that the Particulars recorded by *Moses*, *Gen.* i. and ii. could not all of them take Place within a Day or two of the Creation of Man. But how soon soever the *Fall* happened, *that* disproves not Man's original moral Rectitude : It only shews us, that though made capable of *standing*, he might, if left to himself, soon *fall* ; that though furnished with all the Knowledge necessary for him, he did not know all things, but was capable of being *deceived*, and by that means of being *perverted*.

I might

^p A Learned Man, Mr *A. Bedford*, in his *Scripture Chronology*, thinks that the Fall of Man could not well happen till about four Days after his Creation. Probably it was not quite so soon.

That Man was produced by GOD in a State of *absolute Perfection*, or as perfect as it is possible for any one to be, it would be monstrously absurd to suppose: Such a Perfection must be peculiar to the first, greatest, best Being. That our first Father was made by GOD *as perfect as he could have been*; or as perfect as glorified Saints are in the Heaven of the Gospel; or as perfect as *Adam* would have gradually become after a long Continuance in his primitive State; this no thinking Persons can venture to assert. That he was *peccable*, or capable of falling into Sin, is undeniable; but to infer from thence that he was not *Righteous*, as *Socinus* did, is a poor Specimen of the Clearness and Strength of Reasoning, ascribed by no less a Man than Dr T———, to that Author and those of his Party. We do not believe with some, that *Adam's* bodily Senses were to a prodigious Degree acuter than those of all his Descendants, particularly, that his *Eye* was so framed as to be capable of discerning all the *Telescopic Stars*, and the minutest *Corpuscles* that enter into the Contexture of the greater and smaller Bodies in or about this Earth. Neither do we judge it necessary to suppose the first Man, in his original State, was the consummate *Philosopher*, *Mathematician*, *Physician*; or the profound *Divine*, which some *Jewish* Writers, and others from them, have imagin'd him to have been. We insist on nothing in regard to the primitive State of Man, but what may be deduced, by the sober Exercise of *Reason*, out of the old and new Testament. But whatever *necessary* or *voluntary* Imperfections the first Man was made by GOD with, this we find, that GOD made Man upright, or holy; well-affected to his Maker; sincerely disposed for an entire constant Obedience to the Will of GOD; capable of continuing so, and vastly improving upon his original

nal Stock, &c. However, as he could not be *omniscient*, so he was not *impeccable*. His Knowledge, tho' not so diminutive as the *Socinians* would pretend, was not so great, but that he might be imposed upon, as he really was by some sophistical Reasoning or other. Consequently he was capable of being drawn away from his Allegiance to *God*, and persuaded to act contrary to *his* Commands. After all the Noise, and darkening Disputes, about the *Origin of moral Evil*, the Scripture gives this plain easy Solution of it: The *Understanding* of the first Man was capable of being *deceived*, and his *Will* by that Means, of being *perverted*.

I might now add, and insist upon, the Reflections following. *What* an excellent and happy Creature was Man at first! *How* much does it concern every one to look back upon, and endeavour for a distinct Knowledge of, the primitive State of Man? *How* greatly do the sinful Posterity of *Adam* differ, from what he was originally made by *God*! *How* undesirable a Thing is it for *Man* to be left to the Freedom of his own Will? *How* vain and foolish is the Self-Confidence of sinful Man? *What* Reason has every true Christian to praise God, for the Promises of Pardon, renewing Grace, and persevering Strength belonging to the new Covenant, and for the Hopes which those Promises give him, of being preserved in *Jesus Christ*, and kept by his mighty Power thro' Faith unto Salvation! *Who* that considers, how soon Man, with all the Perfection and Powers of his primitive State, fell from God, can hope to get safe to Heaven, if not interested in such new Covenant Promises as I just now hinted at? *Admirable* indeed is the free, rich Grace, that preserves weak, tempted, and imperfectly renewed or sanctified Christians, safe unto God's heavenly Kingdom, and makes them more than Conquerors over all their Enemies.—But not to insist on these things,
plainly

plainly suggested by the foregoing Discourse, I content myself with two Remarks.

1. What absurd and unscriptural Accounts do some give of the primitive State of Man? “*Adam*, says *Socinus*, and those of his Party, was like a Child, he knew not that he was naked; he had no Notion of the Virtue of the Tree of Knowledge; he knew not himself to be mortal, &c.” Thus they represent the first Man as a mere Babe in Understanding! “Let us conclude, says *Socinus*, that *Adam*, before he transgressed the Command of God, was not just or righteous.” “That Man was adorned with Holiness from his Creation, says *Smalcus*, is an old stinking Fable.” They speak of him, as before his Fall, *mortal*, and *prone to Sin*. “In Man, as consisting of Flesh and Spirit, (say *Bellarmin*, and other Papists) there were at first, different and contrary Propensities, which rendered his doing well difficult to him. God therefore to provide a Remedy against that Distemper, and Weakness of human Nature, gave to Man Original Righteousness for a Curb and Check to his sensitive Appetite.” In Man there was not only a possibility of sinning, but an Inclination to sin, such as we find in ourselves since the Fall.” Thus do the *Roman Doctors*, at once, acknowledge in Words, and take away the original Righteousness of Man. But whereas they often mention the *Original Righteousness* of our first Parents, without true and just Conceptions of it, this is not the only Instance that might be given of their speaking with *Augustin*, and thinking with the *Pelagians*, and *Socinians* as a learned Man proves^r against them. If God made Man upright or righteous; if Man was created not only with the *natural* Image of God, in being *intelligent*, and *free*; but with his *moral* Image too: he was far from being so foolish, and

C 2

weak

^r Mr *William Jameson* in his *Roma Racoviana, & Racovia Romana*.

weak, and prone to Sin, as *Pelagians*, *Socinians*, and *Papists* agree to represent him. For a further Proof of the Possibility and Reality of Man's *Original moral Rectitude*, I might observe, that Man was made a little lower than the Angels, and *these* were at first made by God *righteous*, as our Lord hints, *John* viii. 44. "He was a Murderer from the Beginning, and abode not in the Truth; because there is no Truth in him." By *Truth* is there meant, Veracity, Fidelity, Integrity, so called, as being a Conformity to Truth, or a Principle disposing a Person to speak and act agreeably to *Truth*, 2 *John* ii. iv. 3 *John* 4. That of *Christ*, *he abode not in the Truth*, answers to that in *Jude*, *They kept not their first Estate*. That the Devil abode not in the Truth, is evident, says *Christ*, *because*, now, and from the Beginning aforementioned, *there is no Truth*, no Veracity, or Faithfulness, or Sincerity to be found in him. Since therefore, Man was made at first *upright*, in the Image of God, and but a little lower than the Angels, whom God formed *Spirits*, and *righteous*; we may from hence, together with the aforementioned Arguments, conclude, whatever *Pelagians*, *Socinians*, and *others* say to the contrary, that Man was originally made with such moral Dispositions, as that, he no sooner began to exercise Thought and Reflection, than he entertained, with Regard to his great and good Creator, Thoughts of Love, Admiration, Gratitude, and Readiness for all Obedience: But he abode not in that original State of Uprightness, of which there is this affecting Proof, that since the Fall, *there is no Truth*, or Uprightness, or Disposition to act conformably to Divine Truth, when revealed to him, but what is breathed into his Soul by the renewing, sanctifying Spirit.

2. From the Doctrine of *Man's Original Righteousness*, we may now fairly conclude the entire Doc-
trine

trine of *Original Sin*. These two stand or fall together. Do but clearly prove the *former*, and you lay a good Foundation for a Proof of the *latter*. For this Reason it is, that some so earnestly protest against *Original Righteousness*, because they dread the Consequences of owning it, and know, that either they must deny this, or incur the Danger of being driven upon the Doctrine of *Original Sin*; the very Thoughts of which, are terrible to them. They will close in with the absurdest Tenets, and withstand the plainest Truths, rather than believe *this*. They won't behold Man in the Beauty and Glory of his *Original Uprightness*, because they dread looking upon themselves as *by Nature* fallen Creatures, and *Children of Wrath*. If Man was not at first made righteous and holy, it follows, that he did not, could not, when he sinned, fall from such an holy State; and that the first Transgression exposed him to nothing more than temporal Sorrow, and bodily Death; in Consequence of which his Posterity may be born liable to the same, without being born *Sinners*, or deriving Guilt and a corrupt Nature from their first Father. But on the other Hand, if the human Nature was, in the first Man, created *Holy*, or *upright*, from thence it follows, (1.) That Man lost his original Righteousness, when he fell, and therewith his primitive Title to God's Favour, and the Communion with God, which, as made *upright*, he was inclinable to, and qualified for. (2.) If Man by his Fall, sustained such *Losses* as these, he incurred thereby a *spiritual* Death, as well as a *corporal* one. It render'd him *prone to Sin*: He contracted a moral Inability to serve God in a due manner, tho' the Obligations thereto are immutable. Upon his *Fall*, (which on a Supposition of his being created, after God, in Righteousness and true Holiness, was a great deal more heinous and guilty than it could be, in case
of

of his not being *so* made by God,) he became *dead in Sin*, and a *Child of Wrath*, as well as liable to a bodily Death ; which being granted, or proved, as plainly consequent on the Doctrine of the Original Righteousness of Man before the Fall, it becomes easy to argue and confirm the Doctrine of Man's native Corruption and Guilt, *since the Fall*. With such a Nature, not as God gave to *Adam* at first ; but, as he contracted by his Fall from God, are all his Posterity as such, in every Age born.—The Doctrine of *Man's Original Righteousness*, then, being plainly proved in this little Discourse, nothing more is necessary to guard us against the Infection of every Scheme proposed in Opposition to the Doctrine of *Original Sin* ; however, I shall advance one Step farther, and from the *Original Righteousness* of Man proceed to God's *Original Covenant* with our first Father, for himself, and all his Posterity : *This*, with the *other* being the impregnable Basis of the true Scripture Doctrine of *Original Sin*.



S E R M O N.

S E R M O N II.

G E N. ii. 16, 17.

And the Lord God commanded the Man, saying, of every Tree of the Garden thou may'st freely eat : But of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the Day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.

I Shall next shew, from the Text before us, explained by and joined with some other Scriptures, that, when God made Man at first, he not only chose to govern him, by a Law suited to his Nature as made *rational* and *holy*, but he entered into a *Covenant* with him, promising, or giving him to expect Eternal Life, on condition of his submitting to a particular Restraint for a Time, together with continuing to yield such an Obedience to the Law of Nature, as he was formed both capable of, and inclinable to ; and threatening *Death*, a miserable Death, in case of his presuming to transgress ; which *Covenant* of Life and Death, was made with the first Man, both for himself, and all his natural Descendants. *Adam* was not only the *natural*, but the *federal Head*, of Mankind. It was the Will of God, that he should stand

stand or fall for himself, and all who were, in a natural Way, to descend from him.

In the Text observe, (1.) The Names given to Man's Creator. (2.) Man's original Subjection to his Creator's legislative Authority. (3.) A positive Divine Institution given to Man.

First, The Names given to Man's Creator in the Text are, *The Lord God*, in the *Hebrew*, *Jehovah Elohim*; the former of which is translated *Lord*, and the other *God*, throughout the Old Testament. *Jehovah* is not a Term of Authority, as the *English* Word *Lord* properly is. It comes from a *Verb* that signifies *to be*; so that it signifies properly, *the being*, or *Being itself*. *Jah*, *Psal.* lxxviii. 4. is a Contraction of it. I am that I am, the first and the last; each of these is a *Periphrasis* of it. The Conjunction of these two Names, one singular, and the other plural, so frequently, and that with singular Verbs, of which there is an Instance in the Text; *this* many take to be expressive of the *Trinity*, or a Proof of somewhat like personal Distinctions in the one living and true God.

Secondly, Express mention is made in the Text of Man's original Subjection to his Creator's legislative Authority. *The Lord God commanded the Man*. All the Creatures, as such, are necessarily subject to the Will of God; and God's intelligent Creatures should be so *willingly*, and of Choice. A Creature independant on either the *Power* or the *Will* of God; a Being *made* by him, but not *governed* by him, in a Manner agreeable to it's Nature, is a Contradiction in Terms. Man, as made by God *Rational*, (capable of discerning his Relations and Obligations to him) *in that respect*, was governable by a *Law*. Accordingly he was naturally subject to the Legislative Will and Authority of his *Maker*, who wou'd not, cou'd not, make Man *upright* towards himself, or holy, without giving him a Law agreeable

able to his holy upright Nature ; the Substance of which was, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine Heart, &c.* This Divines call, *the Law of Nature*, which Appellation of it is just and proper, as it was the very *Law* that God wrote on the Heart of Man at first. Indeed God's making Man *upright*, evidently implies, and is the same with, his putting into him a Principle of Obedience to this natural Law ; or a Readiness to perform what such a Law as *that* demanded from him. If God would make such a Creature as Man, he could not but require him to love the Lord his God with his whole Heart, and to continue obedient to him in all things. But this *Law of Nature* was not the only *Law* that Man in his primitive State was subject to ; for,

III. We have in the Text a positive divine Institution to this Purpose, *Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the Tree of Knowledge—thou shalt not eat, for &c.* Besides *the Law of Nature* summarily comprehended in Love to God as God, and Love to others for his Sake, Man was originally bound by such a *positive Law* as is expressed in the Text. Observe in it,

1. God's gracious Indulgence to his Creature Man.

2. The Restraint he was pleased to put him under.

3. The Threatning of Death expressed ; and,

4. The Promise of Life evidently imply'd.

First, God's gracious Indulgence to his Creature Man. *Of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat.* The Garden of *Eden* was a most delightful Spot, and better furnished than any other Part of the *primitive Earth*. The first Man was not created in it, but soon, or immediately on his Creation, brought into it. In this *Garden* he had Liberty enough ; there being a large Variety of wholesome delicious Fruits, which he was allowed freely

to partake of. Besides other Trees, *Two* were most remarkable, the Tree of Life, and that mentioned in the Text. The *former* might be so called, partly because the Fruits of it had a singular Virtue in them, by the Blessing of God, to preserve the Life, Health and Vigour of innocent Man; and chiefly, because it was a Symbol, a Seal, of the Eternal Life promised to Man, and that he would have certainly partook of, had he preserved his *Original Innocence*. As to the Name of the *other* Tree, that will be accounted for presently.—Man in the Garden of *Eden*, had, I say, Liberty enough: God refused nothing to him that was needful for him. If God's Indulgence to him had been much more limited than it was, there had been no room for reasonable Complaint. This, of every Tree of the Garden thou mayest, or shalt, freely eat, might be both a *Permission*, and an *Appointment*. If the latter, it must be render'd, "thou shalt freely eat," if the former only, our Translation is just.—"thou mayest freely eat," in the *Hebrew* it is *eating thou shalt eat*, or eating thou may'st eat; Verbs of the future Tense being often of a *potential* Signification.

2. The Restraint that Man was put under, was only this, *But of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou shalt not eat of it*. Why was this Tree so call'd, and why did God forbid Man to take of the Fruit of it? 'Twas called by the Name mentioned; because by means of eating the Fruit of this Tree, Man came to know, by sorrowful Experience, what both *Good* and *Evil* were; or to signify to Man that if he should presume to eat of this forbidden Fruit, he would then know to his cost, *Good* and *Evil*; the *Good* he had lost, and the *Evil* he was now liable to.—God forbid Man to eat of this Tree, not because the Fruit of it tended in itself to impair the *Health*, and shorten the *Life*
of

of Man; not as though an abstaining from the Fruit of this Tree was, in the Nature of Things, more necessary than an Abstinence from any others, but in token of his own sovereign Authority, and for the Exercise of Man's Love, and the Trial of his Obedience. If this Prohibition is joined and compared with the foregoing *Grant*, it can't be thought unreasonable.

3. Here is a Threatening of Death in Case of Man's sinning. *In the Day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die: In dying thou shalt die*, which way of speaking is used by the *Hebrews*, as learned Grammarians and Criticks observe, to signify the *Certainty* of a Thing, or the *Perfection* and Fulness of it; or the *Speediness* of it; or the *Continuance* of it. Of the *first* Signification there are some Instances in the former Part of the Text, and *Exod. xix. 12.* Of the *second*, in *Exod. xxi. 19.* Of the *third*, *Zech. viii. 21.* And of the *fourth*, *Gen. viii. 7.* Therefore,

(1.) In *dying thou shalt die*, might be the same with *thou shalt certainly*, or unavoidably, *die*. If thou transgressedst my Command, thou shalt by no Means escape Death. For if God will destroy who can preserve? If God is resolved to kill, who can save alive?

(2.) The meaning of this Phrase, *in dying thou shalt die*, may be this, *Thou shalt suffer every kind of Death*, a spiritual Death, as well as a corporal one. Thy *Body* shall be *mortal*, and thy *Soul* miserable. Some, consistently with their Denial of the Original Righteousness of Man, confine the Threatning of the Text to the Death of the Body. But if God made Man *Upright*, or *Holy*; if Man was at first inspired with a Principle of living to God, or with such a Principle of holy Obedience, as the Scripture terms the *Life of God*; if both *Holiness*, and the *Blessedness* connected with it, are called *Life*

often ; and if the miserable State of the Soul, as well as a Separation of Soul and Body, is expressed by the Word *Death* ; if so, it plainly follows, that the Original Threatning must include nothing less than a Loss of Man's Original Rectitude, his Title to God's Favour, and a Life of happy Communion with God (which, as made by God *Righteous*, he was sufficiently prepared for, and inclined to,) no less than a Loss of, the Animal Life which he partook of in common with the Beasts. Without doubt the *Threatning* must be interpreted according to the primitive State of Man, and what the dismal Consequences of the *Fall* really were.

(3). *In dying thou shalt die*, might be understood thus, *Thou shalt*, in case of eating the forbidden Fruit, *instantly*, and immediately, *die*. Death of every Kind shall be not only unavoidable, but the *immediate* Consequent of thy Disobedience to my Law. I won't spare thee so much as a Day or an Hour. If it be said, How was such a Threatning as this executed, since Man when he eat of the forbidden Fruit was not immediately arrested by Death, but lived nine hundred and thirty Years after it, and not only was suffered to live, but as Divines generally believe was forgiven and saved ? To solve *this*, Some of the *Hebrews* pretend that by a *Day*, in this Threatning, may be meant not a *natural*, or ordinary Day, but a *Day of the Lord*, or a thousand Years, and *Adam*, say they, was oblig'd to yield to the Arrest of Death, before he was a thousand Years old. Others would understand the Threatning *thus*, that Man should certainly die, in case of his continuing *impenitent*. But not to insist on these and some other manifestly false Glosses, the true Answer is this, (1.) If Man was spared and reprieved from Death many Years, the Threatning did nevertheless *immediately* take place : It began to be executed as soon as Man began to sin ; for immediately

mediately on his eating the forbidden Fruit, his Original Righteousness, Title to God's Favour, and Fitness for Communion with God being lost, he was spiritually dead, dead in Sin, and the Life of his Body was become forfeited to the Law and Justice of God. (2.) If Man was not only spared from the Stroke of Death, but forgiven and saved, as I firmly believe, his Salvation was owing to a better *Covenant* than what Man transgressed, and than *innocent* Man had any Notion of.

(4). *Dying thou shalt die, i. e.* thou shalt die *for ever*. Man, before he fell, had no Prospect given him of a Recovery to Life and forfeited Happiness, in case of his presuming to do what God forbid. So that Death *temporal*, and Death *eternal* were the Contents of the Original Threatning. From hence, by the Way, let us infer *how* great an Evil *Sin* is; *how* much it deserves the Abhorrence of every rational Creature, and with what Earnestness of Desire we should seek after Deliverance from so cursed a Thing, so malignant a Distemper, so threatning a Plague. So abominable is Sin, in the Nature of it, that an infinitely gracious and good Being has threatned to punish his own Creatures, the Works of his hands, with *bodily Death*, and *endless Misery*, for Sin.

4. As there is a *Threatning of Death*, or Misery, express'd, so there is a *Promise of Life*, or Happiness, implied. From the Text's mentioning no *Promise*, together with the *Threatning*, it follows not that innocent Man had no Hope, no Prospect given him of eternal Life, or everlasting Blessedness, provided he should continue obedient. For

1. *Would* so good and gracious a Being as God threaten *Death*, in Case of Disobedience, and not promise *Life*, every kind of Life, in case of Man's continuing to obey? To suppose, as some have done, that Man while innocent, was liable to Death,

Death, and that he had no Promise, or Prospect given him, of eternal Life, to encourage his continuing obedient, 'till it should please his Maker to endow him with the Grace and Privilege of *Confirmation*, Dos not *this* impeach the Goodness of God? But God forbid that we should so derogate from the Goodness of the Almighty, as to assert, either that he made an innocent Creature liable to Death, or that after Man's continuing innocent for a Time, God could have inclined to put an end to his Being, Life, and happy State. If God might, *possibly*, have thus dealt with Man, his threatening Death, *only in Case of Man's transgressing*, intimated however, a Resolution on God's Part to deal much more kindly with his new made Creature.

2. Could there be such a *Threatning* of Death, as has been explained, without such a *Promise* of Life as is pleaded for? There could not, since the Meaning of the Text must be, Thou shalt forfeit thy present Life, with all the Happiness that attends, and might result from, thine Original Rectitude and Interest in my Favour, if thou abstainest not from what I forbid. What is *Death*, but a Privation of *Life*? The Threatning therefore, gave Man to expect an immediate forfeiture of his original Life, and happy State, as what would have continued with Improvements, if Man should continue obedient.

3. Dos not the *Law* promise, since the Fall, eternal Life to Obedience, as well as threaten Death to Man's Disobedience, since the Tenor of it is, *Do and Live*; or *if thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments*; or *the Man that doth them shall live by them*; as well as "Cursted is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law, to do them."—'Tis plain then, that God would not, could not, consistently with his

his moral Perfections, threaten Death to Man *falling*, without promising Life to Man *standing*. Now a Law given by God, with a Promise of Life, and a Threatning of Death consented to by Man, evidently and fully amounts to a Covenant of Life, or a Covenant of Works, made with Man in his primitive State. For what is a *Covenant*? Is there not such a Thing when two or more Parties transact with each other, and enter into an Agreement on certain Terms? In this Sense God *covenanted* with Man, and Man *covenanted* with God, *i. e.* God not only gave to his Creature Man a Law, requiring Obedience and forbidding every Act of Disobedience, but he signified to him that his continuing to enjoy the happy State he was placed in, (his Title to God's Favour, his Communion with God, and all the Pleasures that might and would perpetually flow from thence,) depended on his good Behaviour, and his preserving his primitive Innocence, or moral Rectitude. *This* Man, as made by God, *upright*, consented to. Thus it appears that God and *Man*, did implicitly and really *covenant* with each other. But for preventing Mistakes, and guarding against the most material Objections, I add,

1. When we speak of God's entring into a Covenant of Life with innocent Man, the meaning is not, that when God had made Man, he assumed an human, or some external visible Form, and *then*, in the manner of one Person formally treating with another, spake to this Purpose; I have made you *Adam*, holy and happy: The Happiness you enjoy, or art in a Fitness for the Enjoyment of, shall continue, and shall increase rather than be any ways diminished, if during a certain Period determined by my Pleasure, thou continuest to submit to the Restraint I put thee under; but if thou darrest to disobey my declared Will, thou shalt become

come a wretched miserable Creature. Without condescending to so formal and solemn a Procedure as that, GOD might, and doubtless did, signify to *Adam's* Conscience upon what Terms he must expect to be dealt with, as to *Life* or *Death*, Happiness or Misery.

2. We don't assert, that Man had an Hope, or Promise given him, of being, after some Time, translated from Earth to Heaven, (if he had, 'tis however, more than we know, we neither deny nor assert it;) but what we plead for is, that God gave Man to expect a State of never ceasing Blessedness, at least a perpetual Enjoyment of such an Happiness as he had in Possession, which in case of Man's persisting in his Duty would have been a growing and increasing Happiness, rather than a *diminishing* one. The *Heaven* of the Blessed is a *State* rather than a *Place*. Wherever the Creature enjoys God without Sin, or any Degree of Misery and Suffering, *there is Heaven*. Of such a Blessedness there may be, and doubtless are, various Degrees. If *Adam* had stood; with his Original Rectitude, Communion with God, and the Happiness perpetually resulting from thence, he might have been as happy in the *terrestrial Paradise* as any where else. *Adam* without Doubt was sensible of *this*, that nothing but *Sin* could forfeit for him, the Happiness which, as made by God upright, he was prepared and fitted for the perpetual Enjoyment of, either in the Garden of *Eden*, or in some other Regions of the Universe.

3. Whether this Original Transaction between God and innocent Man, is expressly called a *Covenant* or no, it might nevertheless bear that Name. Some think that it is so called, *Hos. vi. 7. Like Adam*, so it is in the Original, *they have transgressed the Covenant*. We meet with the same Expression, *Job xxxi. 33. If I cover'd my transgressions, as Adam*.

4. What

4. What though there is an infinite Disproportion between God and *innocent Man*, and *that* might seem to render a Covenant between them impossible? There can be, say some, no proper Covenant between God and his *Creatures*; Why? because there is so vast a Distance between them; and because Man, as God's Creature, was naturally and unavoidably obliged to do, or omit, whatever his Maker should require. But though some covenanting Parties are equal, or nearly so, why may there not be a real proper Agreement between Parties greatly unequal, one of whom is under all possible prior Obligations to the other? If one greatly superior will freely condescend to treat with another much inferior, and incapable of being profitable to him, this does not annul the mutual Agreement, or hinder it's being of the nature of a *Covenant*; it only manifests the great Condescension of the *Covenanter*, and is a signal Honour done to the *Covenantee*. Has not God engaged himself by free gracious Promises, to *Abraham*, *Israel* of old, his People in the Gospel, and taken them into Covenant with *himself*? If so, what should hinder his *so* dealing with the first Man in his primitive State, who, as perfectly *upright* towards God, was rather more able to perform what God required, and on some Accounts fitter to covenant with God, than any of Mankind are *since*?

I conclude then with Assurance, that God having made Man upright, entered into a Covenant of Life with him for himself; and in the next Place undertake to prove, that the first Man was not only the *natural Head*, but the *federal*, or *legal Representative* of all who were, in an ordinary way, to descend from him. The Covenant was made with *Adam*, not only for *himself*, but *them* also. The *Holiness* and *Happiness* of his primitive State

he was to preserve, or lose, for himself and all his natural Descendants. This I argue,

1. From the Tenor of the original Threatning, as compared with the present natural State of Mankind. That every one of *Adam's* Posterity is *born liable to Death*, all will grant: That the *Death* which every one of them is, from his Birth, nay before his Birth, obnoxious to, was not threatned at first but in case of Man's sinning, is no less undeniable: That *Man* was not mortal, or liable to die, till he fell, and his being *so* then was a Result from the Threatning in the Text, this too is, I think, evident enough; as also that the Scripture constantly points at *Sin*, as the sole proper Cause of *Death*, and *all Sufferings*: For, says the Apostle, "The Wages of Sin is Death," where he speaks not merely of the first Sin, and the Death threatned for that, but Sin in the general. Every kind of Sin is considered as the Cause of *Death*, and as justly exposing to it, by virtue of the Threatning of the Sovereign Lawgiver; so that whoever sin, they deserve to suffer Death, and whoever are liable to suffer Death, it is for *Sin*, as justly deserving it. When by one Man *Sin* entered into the World, it brought along with it Death^s. Sin hath reigned over all Mankind, so far as to expose them to Death^t. If the Body is dead, it is because of Sin^u. Now if Mankind are born liable to *that* which was originally threatned, only in case of *Sin*, this makes out the Concern of every one of *Adam's* Descendants in the *original Threatning*, consequently in the *original Promise*. Whoever was concerned in *either* of these, he was, without all Question, concerned in the *other*. Now that each of us was concerned in the *Threatning*, is evident from hence, that antecedently to all Acts of Sin-

^s Rom. v. 12.

^t Rom. v. 21.

^u Rom. viii. 10.

ning we are liable to *Death*. What can this be owing to, but either the arbitrary Will of God, or the original Threatning? To suppose the *former* is to impeach the Goodness and Equity of Providence, which does not afflict any of Mankind *willingly*^w, or grieve them undeservedly, but punishes Sin with Death, according to the *Threatnings* of his Word, of which *that* given to the first Man was a summary Compend.

2. I will next argue from 1 *Corinth. xv. 22. In Adam all die*. Here the Apostle speaks not of *both* our first Parents, but of *Adam singly*, as elsewhere^x. He does not say, *in Adam and Eve*, but *in Adam*, whom he therefore points at as, in a special peculiar way, related to Mankind. The *all* mentioned, are all the natural Descendants of the *first Man* as such. Their dying *in him*, or *by him*, or *through him*, or *for him*, (the Greek Particle admits of any of these renderings) it is a being liable to Death on the account of their Relation to him, and Descent from him. It is not merely a *bodily Death*, but a wretched miserable Death, a Death of the Body attended with a succeeding endless Destruction of the whole Man, that the Apostle speaks of as arising from the Sin of *Adam*; because it stands opposed not to a bare Revival of the Body, but an happy and glorious Resurrection, such as all belonging to Christ, or all the true Members of his Body, are to partake of at his second coming; as any one who will but open his Eyes may perceive in the latter Words of the Verse, explained by the Verse following. The *Apostle* speaks not one Word, throughout this Chapter, of the Resurrection of the Ungodly; but only of *Christ's*,

^w Lament. iii. 33.

^x Rom. v. 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, of which Passage see an Explication in Opposition to *Pelagian Glosses*, in my Sermon on *Job xiv. 1, 2. p. 18, &c.*

and that of *his Saints*, as consequent upon *his*. In *Adam* all die, *i. e.* all the Descendants of the first Man are from their Birth, or on the account of their Concern with him, obnoxious to *Death* and *Misery*, which as his Descendants they could not be, did they not sin in *him*, and fall with *him*. Now if they therefore die in *him*, because they sinned in *him*, (Death being the Wages of Sin, and Sin the sole proper Cause of Death, whoever suffer it) if so, it follows that they must have been, in him, righteous and holy, antecedently to his sinning; and from the Time of his Creation, and consenting to the Terms of the old Covenant, he must have been the federal Head of all to descend naturally from him.

3. With the foregoing Text I might join v. 45, and 47. of the same Chapter. The *first Man Adam*, and the *last Adam*, (the second Man) are there opposed. *Adam* and *Christ* are pointed at as two publick Persons or Heads. Why is *Christ*, notwithstanding the Millions of Mankind intervening between *Adam* and *him*, and following after his Birth, called as here the *last Adam*, and the *second Man*? An Answer to this may be taken not only from the Text already considered, but from *Rom. v. 12, 14, &c.* where *Adam* singly is said to be a *Figure of Christ*; and the Resemblance between them is made to consist in this, that as *Guilt* and *Death* descend from the one to all *his*, so *Righteousness* and *Life* derive from the other to all *his*. If therefore *Adam's* Fall did not involve Mankind in Guilt, neither does the Obedience or Righteousness of *Christ* procure a Title to eternal Life for all true Believers. If *Adam* did not undertake for his Descendants as well as himself, neither did *Christ* undertake to procure Salvation for all who sincerely believe on him; as in the Passage before us, and in many other Places, we are plainly told he did.

As

As was the *wretched* Influence of our first Fathers first Transgression, such is the *blessed* Influence of the Obedience of the second *Adam*, *Rom. v. 17, 18, 19.* Consequently what *Christ* is in regard to all whom he justifies and saves, that is *Adam* in regard to all his natural Descendants, a *publick Person*, a *federal Head*, a *legal Representative*.

Moses indeed dos not expressly tell us *this* in his History : As he dos not plainly tell us, it was the *Devil* who seduced *Eve*, and, God gave to Man a Promise of Life to encourage his Obedience, as well as a Threatning of Death to deter him from transgressing, and, *Levi* paid Tythes to *Melchisedech* in *Abraham* (which Things are notwithstanding deducible from other Parts of Scripture); so he has not expressly told us, that Mankind sinned in *Adam*, and were originally righteous in him, and treated with by God in him; but he has delivered *that* in his brief concise Account of the primitive State of Man, from which, by the Help of other Scriptures, 'tis no difficult matter to infer it.—But some will say again,

If this is so *momentous* a Truth, as it must be if a Truth, 'tis strange it should not be more plainly and frequently stated in the Scripture. *R. (1.)* If it is at all mentioned in the Word of Truth, *that* is sufficient to oblige our Assent to it : *(2.)* 'Tis a Mistake to suppose, that it is not plainly and frequently told us : For we often meet with *that* in the Scripture from whence it may be rationally deduced. As often as it speaks of our being born mortal, of our being Sinners from our Birth, of our being fallen Creatures, of the Necessity of the holy Image of God being re-instamped on our Souls, &c. so often dos it implicitly suggest to us what we are now pleading for.—But the most material Objection is yet behind.

Why

Why should God appoint the first Man to be a publick Person, to stand or fall for so many others besides himself, since he fore-knew that in such a Case, he would by falling ruin both *himself* and *them*?—To this I answer,

First, Making use of the Words of the Apostle on a like Occasion, *Who art thou, O Man, who repliest against God?* Dos not the infinitely wise God better know how to act than any Man can direct him? Shall the Potsherds of the Earth presume to contend with Sovereign Authority, and say, What doest thou? Are not the Judgments of the Most High unsearchable, and many of his Ways past finding out? If the Scripture teaches us that the first Man was the *Federal* as well as *Natural* Head of Mankind, or suggest *that* from which this Doctrine may be fairly concluded; it becomes us to submit, and to acknowledge the Goodness, Wisdom, and Equity of such a Constitution: Why? Because it is God's. The Question is, Was *Adam* our legal and federal Head, or was he not? If he was not, why dos the Apostle say, *In Adam all die, as in Christ all are to be made alive*, and, *By one Man's Disobedience many were many Sinners*, &c. From whence are the Cries, Pains, Distempers, and Death of poor helpless Infants? From whence our early Proneness to sinful Ways, though none but good Examples are set before us, and continual pious Instructions are given us, which is the Case of some, but from the *Sin of our Nature*, consequent on our Loss of original Righteousness, by the Fall of our first Father? We may, and we should look upon *Infants* with Compassion; but must always endeavour to acquiesce in what God has wisely and justly ordered, *Even so Father, for so it seemeth good in thy Sight*. As to those who regard not the Old and New Testament as the Rule of their Faith, it is impossible

impossible to convince *such* either of the *Goodness* and *Equity*, or of the *Reality* of this Divine Constitution. This is not a Truth to be immediately proposed to *their* Belief, or to be argued with *them*. As to those who profess to believe the Scripture, but are not convinced of the Truth and Reality of the Appointment mentioned, it would be vain, as yet, to argue with them that it is *good* and *right*. Such must be first convinced of the *Reality* of it, from which it will be reasonable to conclude the *Goodness* and *Equity* of it. But if there are any who apprehend that the Doctrine we plead for seems to rest on a Scripture Bottom, but they can't help suspecting that the Texts we found it upon may possibly be mistaken, only because they can't make out the Goodness and Equity of it, I would endeavour to offer what may quiet the Minds of *such*. Have not several of us been perplexed upon this Head? Let me ask you this *Question*; Have you not thought of this Matter with some Concern, and on a Supposition of God's having appointed the first Man to stand or fall for all his natural Descendants, without taking effectual care to prevent his falling, have you not been almost ready to accuse *God*? It must not be denied, that, for the sake of this Doctrine, and some others, many ignorantly reproach the Scripture, and rashly reject either the entire Christian Revelation, or those Doctrines of particular discriminating Grace which are the Marrow and Substance of it.—Two or three Things are obvious, and them I begin with.

1. If a *Representative* of Mankind was to be appointed, none could be fitter to sustain such a Character than that first Man, from whom all others were to descend. If it was proper for God to enter into a Covenant of Life with any one for all the rest, with whom could he *so treat* more justly than with our original Parent? Now can any one demonstrate,

monstrate, that it was improper, unfitting, unworthy of the Divine Perfections, for any one to be *so* constituted and covenanted with? Do not, or may not, Parents undertake for themselves and their Heirs? Why might not the first Man be ordained, and consent to be a common Trustee or Depositary? Certainly *he* might, if any.

2. If God having appointed *Adam* to stand or fall for others besides himself, had taken care to preserve him from falling; and if thereupon he had transmitted Righteousness and eternal Life to all his Descendants, in that case none would have complained of his having been by God's Appointment their covenanting Representative: None would then have said, Why was *one* ordained to stand or fall for the *rest*? or, Why were not we and all others left to stand or fall each one for himself? So that the Difficulty, and the Appearance of Unreasonableness, that some complain of, lies here: Why did not God confirm Man in his primitive State? or, Why did he suffer Mankind to fall into Sin? But can any prove, that God might not, consistently with his moral Perfections, permit the Entrance of Sin? or that 'tis not better for the Entrance of Sin to be *suffered* than *prevented*, considering the Use that infinite Wisdom could make of such a Dispensation?

3. If God having appointed the first Man a publick Person, and having likewise permitted him, as such, to fall, had been pleased to take effectual Method, for an *universal actual* Recovery, this, all will grant, would have justified the Conduct of Providence in appointing one, even our first Father, to stand or fall for all Mankind. But to ordain *that one Man* to act for all his Descendants, and to permit the Fall of the whole human Race *in him*, without making an effectual Provision for *as general* a Recovery: This is what many are disposed

disposed to exclaim against as unreasonable, over severe, and unworthy of God. As to which I shall only offer one thing. If it had pleased God to appoint each of Mankind to stand on his own Bottom, and *then* to permit all of them to fall into Sin, without undertaking for the Recovery of so much as *one* ; will any dare to say that such a Conduct would have been *unjust* ? Yet such a Procedure as *that* would have been full out as severe, and difficult to account for, as what we suppose consequent on the Fall of Mankind in their first Father : For in consequence of *that* we believe, that God effectually provides for the *certain final Salvation of some*, while he with-holds from none of Mankind any thing *due* to them, and instead of *that* vouchsafes such Advantages as render all who perish, especially among them to whom the Gospel is preached, greatly inexcusable. But it is my present Concern to vindicate God's having constituted the first Man a publick Person, and treated with him for all his Descendants, which, whatever are the Consequences of it, 1. Must not be complained of, because it was injurious to none concerned, neither to *Adam* himself, nor any of his Offspring. Why ? because if each had been left to stand or fall for himself, his *standing* would not have been more secure than it was in *Adam*, neither would his *Fall* have been more avoidable than that of every one really was in *him*. For *Adam* was made by God *upright* ; as such he was capable of performing his Duty with ease, and as able to continue obedient as any other could have been, if left to stand or fall for himself. So that God granted to *all* a Possibility of being for ever happy in their first Father ; as good a Possibility, that is, as any one could have had, if God had ordered his standing on his own Bottom. Why then should
F any

any complain? It was no Disadvantage to *thee*, consequently not at all injurious to *thee*, for God to treat with thy first Father, for himself and all his Descendants; since if God had dealt *otherwise*, had created all Mankind at once, and had treated with each singly for himself, every one would have been as liable to fall as *Adam* was; and if God had not effectually prevented it, (which he could have been no ways obliged to) he would as really and certainly have fallen. If there is that Man in the World, who can stand forth and say, *Adam's* being the federal Head of Mankind was a Disadvantage and Injury to me: it had been better for me if I had been left to stand on my own Legs; I should have done better for myself than *Adam* took care to do; my standing had been more secure: I could and would have continued in my primitive State; and therefore as I did not chuse *Adam* for my *Trustee*, none had any Authority *so* to appoint him, or to do what was so much disadvantageous and injurious to *me*. If any one could rightly plead to this Purpose, there might be some room for reasonable Complaint. But no wise Person, who reflects on the original State of our first Father, can pretend what I have now supposed. *Adam* was as capable of standing as any of Mankind could have been, without that effectual Grace which God was not bound to give, and which the new Covenant, in consequence of the Ruin of Mankind in *Adam*, engages for. For *Adam* was made upright; and that original *Uprightness* of his included sufficient divine Knowledge; a Conformity of Man's Will to God's; a steady Inclination to obey God in all things; Abilities to continue what he was, and to improve the Stock put into his Hands. The Promise and the Threatning given him had *both* of them a Tendency to hold him

him

him to his Duty: Besides that, a knowing how much the Interests of his Posterity were to depend on on his Conduct, would naturally make him rather more cautious than any one of Mankind, if left to stand or fall purely for himself, would probably have been. 'Tis *Folly* and *Perverseness*, therefore, for any to complain of the Divine Conduct in treating with Mankind in such an one as *Adam* was; since none can prove they were injured thereby, and since it was an Advantage (all things considered) rather than a Disadvantage to the whole Race; consequently it was not an unreasonable Procedure, or unworthy of the Divine Perfections; especially if herewith it be considered, that if every one had stood on his own Bottom, and all had failed, God might in that case have refused Mercy to all; whereas *now*, in consequence of the Fall of Mankind in *Adam*, effectual care is taken for the Recovery of *some*, in a Way most gloriously manifestative of all the Divine Perfections, and the *rest* so dealt with, as to be greatly inexcusable. I add,

2. God might appoint *Adam* to be a publick Person, for the sake of his being a Type and Figure of him who was to come. That *Adam* was a Figure of *Christ*, the Apostle expressly tells us, *Rom. v. 15*. For though, one^y, by *him who was to come*, understands *Mankind*, the whole Tenor of the Apostle's Discourse plainly directs us to understand it of no other than *him* whom he elsewhere calls the *Second Adam*, and whom he points at as the Fountain of *Righteousness* and *Life*, as the First *Adam* was of *Sin* and *Death*. If *Adam* was not a federal Head, neither was *Christ*: If *Adam* acted only for himself, so did *Christ*: If *Adam* falling

^y Sir Norton Knatchbull.

did not ruin Mankind ; neither did *Christ*, by punctually performing what he undertook, secure eternal Life to all his Followers. But that *Christ* was a federal Head, and did undertake for others, and by fulfilling all Righteousness procure for them everlasting Salvation, this is undeniably apparent from *Rom. v. 17, 18.* and many other Places, which 'tis not my present Business to insist on.— So that God's appointing *Adam* to be a publick Person, was a *wise* as well as an *equitable* Constitution. As it was injurious to none concerned, so it was wisely contrived to resemble and prefigure *Christ* as undertaking for others.— So that if *Christ*, the second *Adam*, had failed, all whom he undertook for must have perished. But *this* could not be. Why did the first *Adam* fail, and why could not the second *Adam* miscarry too ? The first *Adam* failed, because, as a Creature, he was mutable in himself, and was left to the Freedom of his own Will : The second *Adam* could not miscarry, because he is more than a Creature, and God in our Nature, which if he had not been, he had been as liable to fall as our first Father, and as liable to undo all he was concerned with and undertook for. But this is the Record of the Gospel, that God has given to us eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son, *John v. 11, 12.* — If therefore we make sure of an Interest in *Christ*, we are safe for ever.— In order to *that*, we must be persuaded to accept him, to close with him, to depend on him, and submit to him as the Saviour and King of the Church of God. O *Sinner*, as thou hast sinned in thy first Father, and derived a corrupt Nature from him, consider and lament thine undone State without *Christ*. — Let it be thy great Concern to win *Christ*, and be found in him. — Take him to be thy Lord and Saviour.

viour.—Consent to be beholden to him for the whole of thy Salvation, and to live both *dependant* on him, and *obedient* to him. God grant, for his own Name's sake, that as we have been made *Sinners by the Disobedience of Adam*, so we may be made *Righteous by the Obedience of Christ*; that as we have born the Image of the *earthly*, so we may bear the Image of the *heavenly Adam*; and that as we have died in our first Father, who transgressed the old Covenant of Works, as the Head of Mankind, so *in Christ* we may be made *alive*, or at the Time of his second coming raised up to a blessed Immortality.



APPENDIX.

A P P E N D I X.

THE foregoing plain Sermons lay a Foundation for confirming the entire Doctrine of *Original Sin*, as including the Guilt of *Adam's Fall* imputed, and a corrupt Nature derived from *Adam* to his Posterity. The opposite Principles of Mr T—'s late Book may be reduced to the following Heads, which I here mention, with a distinct short Confutation of each.

I. *Man was originally made rational and free, but not righteous.* This is, το πρωτον ψευδος, the fundamental Mistake of *Pelagians* and *Socinians*, from whom the Papists, for the most part, differ verbally rather than really. According to Mr T—, Man neither was nor could be originally righteous. But let Mr T— declare to the contrary, with ever so much Warmth and Assurance, God made Man *upright*, and *Upright* throughout the Scripture is the same with *Righteous*, or *Holy*. If this Gentleman, or any in the same Sentiments with him, would do any thing to the Purpose, it lies upon them to prove, either that God did not make Man *upright* at first, or that *Uprightness* is not the same with Integrity, godly Sincerity, Righteousness; either that Man was not made in the Image and Like-
ness

ness of God, or that to be created *after God* is not to be created *in Righteousness, and true Holiness*; either that Man in his original State was not *very Good*, or that a rational Being, formed with Capacities of knowing, loving and enjoying God, may be good, justly esteemed so, though not inclinable to serve God, and though his natural Powers are not in a Readiness to act for him. They must prove either that *Man* was not made a little lower than the *Angels*, or that these Spirits were not originally Righteous. Lastly, It concerns them to prove, that a rational Creature may be *innocent*, though he does not love the Lord his God with all his Heart, or that such a sincere prevailing Love to God, which is a Summary of the Duties of the moral Law, is not Righteousness or Holiness, as undoubtedly it is.

II. *When Adam sinned against God, in eating of the forbidden Fruit, he did not fall from an holy State, but rather fell short of it.* This, it must be allowed, is consistent with the foregoing. If Man was not created after God in Righteousness or Holiness of Truth, he could not lose by his Fall what Divines call Original Righteousness. For none can lose what they have not. But be these two Propositions ever so harmonious, they are evidently false. One may wonder that a Man who has spent so much Time in the Study of the Scripture, and who has pursued his Enquiries so diligently and sincerely as Mr T— says he has, should have the Hardiness to assert *either*. If the Scripture is plain in any thing it is so in this, that Man was originally made righteous, and that the original Righteousness of Man was lost by the first Sin, as the former of these two Sermons clearly proves.

III. *Adam's*

III. *Adam's Fall, or first Sin, exposed himself to nothing more than temporal Labour, Sorrow, and bodily Death.* This solely, according to Mr T—, was the Death originally threatned: Of this only he understands *Gen. ii. 17. Rom. v. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.* But if God made Man righteous, as has been proved, and Man lost his original Righteousness by the Fall, it follows, that he incurred thereby a *spiritual* as well as a corporal Death, and exposed himself not only to temporal Afflictions, but to endless Punishment. As we may fairly infer a conditional Grant of eternal Life to innocent Man from the Law's promising such a Life, or an endless happy State, to the Obedience of Mankind since the Fall; so if the Sins of Mankind render them liable to everlasting Punishment *now*, can it be thought that so heinous and complicated an Offence, as *Adam's* eating the forbidden Fruit, did not deserve, and expose him to, an everlasting Separation from the comforting Presence of God, as well as involve him in a present spiritual Death?

IV. *Adam, the common Father of Mankind, was not appointed to stand or fall for any besides himself.* The Guilt of his first Sin, if we hearken to Mr T—, was purely personal. This I have disproved from *Gen. ii. 16, 17. 1 Cor. xv. 21, 45, 47.* with which may be joined *Rom. v. 12, &c.* as to which I add at present but an Hint or two. (1.) None of the Deniers of Original Sin, observe the Force of that Expression, *By one Man Sin entered.* The Apostle plainly means it of *Adam* singly. Though the Devil sinned before any of Mankind, and *Eve's* Transgression was prior to *Adam's*; yet the Apostle says, *By one Man, (i. e. Adam) Sin entered into the World*; where the *World* must not be taken locally

locally but for Mankind, as whom the first Sin of their first Father involved in Guilt, and made liable to Death. (2.) Mr T—'s Gloss on that of the Apostle, *And so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned*, is egregiously trifling, to say no worse, since it confounds two Things that the Apostle carefully distinguishes, *Sin* and *Death*. The same is true as to his Gloss on the other Parts of the Apostle's Discourse, to *ver. 19.* throughout which he plainly points at the same Sin, as the procuring Cause of Death, to *Adam* and all his Descendants; and the Death of *him* and *them* as the penal just Consequent of that first Sin of his.

V. *Excepting the Ignorance and Weaknesses of Infancy, we are naturally in the same State with Adam before his Fall.* But, (1.) If Man was originally righteous, and we, as his Descendants, are not born righteous, as all grant we are not, 'tis evident the original State of Man, and the present natural State of Mankind, are greatly different. (2.) If *Adam* was the federal Head of all his natural Descendants, and in consequence of *that* (which has been proved an equitable, wise, and good Constitution) we sinned in him, and fell with him; if so, we no sooner become *Adam's* Offspring, than a Degree of Guilt is imputed to us; and if God forms our Souls without original Righteousness, he herein acts the Part of a righteous Judge, and we are thereby exposed to an endless Separation from God.

VI. *What the Scripture seems to speak as to our deriving Guilt and a corrupt Nature from Adam; it amounts to no more than this, says Mr T— from the Pelagians and Socinians, That, on Occasion of his Sin, we are Sufferers of temporal Afflictions and*
G
Mortality,

Mortality, which a gracious God turns into an universal Benefit to Mankind. But, (1.) The *Sinning* affirmed of all Men, *Rom. v. 12.* and their *being made Sinners*, ver. 19. must be different from a being liable to temporal Sorrows and Death, because *Sin* and *Death* are by the Apostle so plainly distinguished. (2.) Where is Mr T— warranted to consider temporal Sorrows and Mortality as made, or designed by God for, so universal a Blessing? The Apostle says, *All Things*, all afflictive Events, *work together for Good to them who love God*, &c. but where does the Scripture apply this to Mankind in general? Must *Pelagians*, besides all their other undue Liberties, taken with the Scripture, extend to *all* what the Holy Ghost appropriates to *some*? (3.) Let temporal Sorrows and Mortality be ever so beneficial to many, they are in themselves great Evils, Fruits of Sin, and what descend to each of us from our first sinning Father and Head. If *Man is born unto Trouble*, it is because he is born a fallen Creature; for Man was not made *at first* for the suffering of Trouble. If we are by Nature liable to Death, it is because we are naturally prone to Sin, as being destitute of original Righteousness by reason of the Fall of our first Father. As is the causal Influence of the Obedience of Christ on our Righteousness and Life, such is the Influence of *Adam's* Fall on our Guiltiness and Death; as I hope some one or other will abundantly prove in Confutation of Mr T—'s Book. With what Zeal and Industry that Book has been dispersed in Town and Country, is not unknown to several. But though it seems to be a laboured Work, and is cried up, by some who know little of the Scripture, themselves, and the Grace of God, as unanswerable, it will scarcely pervert any who are not Strangers to experimental Religion; and as it would be no difficult

difficult Undertaking to detect the Sophistry of it, it's Misrepresentations, and numerous Abuses of the Scripture, so I hope a thorough Confutation of it will be ere long given to the Publick.

I conclude with just hinting the principal Texts, and some of the Arguments that may be urged for proving the Doctrine of Original Sin, as laid down in the Assembly's Catechism. The *Texts* are, *Gen. v. 3. ch. vi. 5. ch. viii. 21. Job xi. 12. ch. xiv. 4. ch. xv. 14. Psal. xiv. 1, 2, 3. Ps. li. 5. Prov. xxii. 15. and ch. xxix. 15. John iii. 6. Rom. v. 12, &c. 1 Cor. xv. 22.* The *Arguments* are taken from, our natural Liableness to *Death*, which may be easily proved to be, in the Case of all, the penal Consequent of *Sin*; the Ordinances of Circumcision and Baptism; the Redemption of Christ as extending itself to Infants; every sinful Action being represented in the Scripture as arising from a corrupt sinful Principle; the evident close Connexion of this Doctrine with other important and plainly revealed Truths. From these and other Arguments such a Proof may be given of the Doctrine of Original Sin, as none who pay a due Deference to the inspired Writings will be able fairly to evade.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

PAge 5. l. 4. r. *signify*. p. 8. last line, *or only in a Parenthesis*.
p. 28. l. 14. *thou*. These with some other little Mistakes and Mispointings the candid Reader will excuse.

Lately Published, and Sold by J. OSWALD.

SERMONS and Discourses. In Two Parts. 1. Man's Liableness to Death and Judgment by Reason of Sin, &c. 2. A Discourse on the Apostle Paul's preaching before Felix; and Felix's Answer to Paul's Reasoning with him. Being the Substance of several Sermons preached from Acts xxiv. 25. Price 2 s. 6 d.

An Awakening Call to young Persons: Set forth in a Sermon on Occasion of the Death of three young Persons. Pr. 4 d.

The best Way to provide against Old Age, and to prepare for Death; in a Sermon on Occasion of the Death of Mr Samuel Cotton. Pr. 4 d.

The right Manner of remembering our Lord's Nativity, and the absolute Necessity of being new Creatures: Set forth in two Sermons; one preach'd December 24 and 25. the other January 1. Pr. 6 d.

Job's exemplary Patience described, and proposed to Imitation; in a Sermon on Occasion of the Death of a young Child.

A Treatise on the Lord's Prayer: Designed chiefly to shew what Use may be made of this Platform through all Ages of the Church: That a bare formal Repetition of the Words is unprofitable, and no Act of Religion: That our Lord did not appoint it to be an invariable Form, or a standing compleat Pattern: That it was but a temporary Institution: That the Use of it, as a Form, did not obtain among the primitive Christians, or before the Beginning of the third Century, &c. Pr. 1 s. 6 d.

The Shortness of Human Life, and the various Troubles incident thereto, considered and improved: In a Sermon preached on Occasion of the Death of Mrs Sarah Harper, who died Nov. 27, 1739, aged 23.

*All these by the Reverend Mr SAMUEL HEBDEN,
at Wrentham in Suffolk.*

Where may be had, just Publish'd,

1. A Practical Exposition of the Four Evangelists. For the Use of the Family and the Closet. By John Guyse, D. D.

2. Faith and Practice represented in Fifty-four Sermons, on the principal Heads of the Christian Religion: Preached at Bury-street 1733. By the Reverend I. Watts, D.D. D. Neale, A.M. J. Guyse, D.D. S. Price, D. Jennings, and J. Hubbard. Published for the Use of Families, especially on the Lord's-Day Evenings. In Two Volumes. The Second Edition. Price bound 10 s.

3. A Compleat Concordance to the Holy Scriptures. By A. Cruden, A.M.

